

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-16 are now pending in this application. In the November 10, 2005 Office Action, Claims 1-5, 7, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,591,010 to Russin (hereinafter “*Russin*”). Claims 8 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Russin* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0200078 to Luo et al. (hereinafter “*Luo*”). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Russin* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0227751 to Anders (hereinafter “*Anders*”). Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Russin* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,466 to Siefken (hereinafter “*Siefken*”). Claim 6 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this amendment, claims 1-12 have been cancelled and new claims 17-21 have been added. Following entry of this amendment, claims 13-21 will be pending in the present application. For the reasons set forth below, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and immediate allowance of this application.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the November 10, 2005 office action, Claim 6 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the applicant has cancelled claim 6 and added new claim 17 that incorporates the recitations of original claim 6 and each of the claims from which it depended. Accordingly, the applicant submits that new claim 17 and its dependent claims 18-21 are in condition for immediate allowance.

Claims 13-14

In the November 10, 2005 Office Action, claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Russin* in view of *Anders*. The applicant respectfully submits that *Russin* and *Anders* do not separately or together teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of claims 13 and 14. In particular, with respect to independent claim 13, *Anders* does not teach “displaying a three dimensional image on a computer display monitor according to a first display

orientation;” “rotating the three dimensional image on the computer display monitor to a second display orientation;” “capturing the three dimensional image displayed according to the second display orientation;” or “storing the captured three dimensional image to a memory location.” With respect to claim 14, neither *Anders* nor *Russin* teaches “if the three dimensional image does not rotate to a second display orientation, designating the computer video card as failing an image rotation test.”

Anders teaches a method for generating a three-dimensional image of an object positioned on a rotating turntable. Accordingly, *Anders* does not teach these recitations of independent claim 13. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion to combine *Anders* and *Russin* in the manner suggested by the Examiner. *Russin* teaches a method for detecting and qualifying a portion of a digital image. *Anders* teaches generating a three-dimensional image of an object positioned on a rotating turntable. There is no suggestion in either of these references to combine them in the manner suggested by the Examiner and, even if combined in the suggested manner, would not result in the inventions of claims 13 and 14. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 13 and 14 are in condition for immediate allowance.

Claims 15-16

In the November 10, 2005 Office Action, Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Russin* in view of *Siefken*. The applicant respectfully submits that *Russin* and *Siefken* do not separately or together teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of claims 15 and 16. In particular, with respect to independent claim 15, neither *Russin* nor *Siefken* teaches “displaying frames of the AVI file on a computer display monitor;” “copying one of the displayed frames as a test frame to a bitmap file in a first memory context;” “displaying the bitmap file on the computer display monitor;” “capturing the displayed bitmap file and storing the captured displayed bitmap file to a second memory context;” or “comparing the captured displayed bitmap file in the second memory context to the bitmap file copied to the first memory context on a pixel-by-pixel basis.” With respect to claim 16, neither *Russin* nor *Siefken* teaches “playing the AVI file to determine whether a set of frames comprising the AVI file are displayed on the computer display monitor successively;” or “if the set of frames comprising the AVI file are not displayed on the computer display monitor successively, designating the AVI file as failing an AVI operability test.”

Siefken teaches a method for generating a still image that evolves unnoticeably over time. *Siefken* does not teach the recitations of claims 15 and 16 for displaying and capturing frames of an audio video interleaved file and designating an AVI file as failing an AVI operability test if the captured frames do not match the displayed frames. Moreover, the applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion in either *Russin* or *Siefkin* to combine these references in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Additionally, even if these references were combined in the suggested manner, the combination would not result in the invention of claim 15 and 16. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 16 are in condition for immediate allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

Leonard J. Hope

Date: February 6, 2006

Leonard J. Hope
Reg. No. 44,774

Hope Baldauff Hartman, LLC
P.O. Box 2825
Atlanta, Georgia 30301
Telephone: 404.522.1100

